

Our coalition is not the first to demand more prominent display of the suffrage monument. A year after the statue was removed to the basement storage area, members of the National Woman's Party protested that it was covered with dirt and rubbish. Unable to have the statue cleaned, they brought mops and buckets in and cleaned it themselves. Resolutions to move the statue have been brought before Congress in 1928, 1932 and 1950 but were unsuccessful.

We, like these others who tried before us, want the Suffrage leaders in the rotunda as a visible reminder of the strength and ability of women and as an inspiration to women in the future to continue to fight for their rights. We believe that this, the 75th year after its creation, is the year this effort will be successful.

The Joint Resolution to Move the Statue has already passed unanimously in the Senate and now goes to the House of Representatives. We ask that our Representatives recognize the importance of women voters by joining the Senate in this resolution and we remind them that in a democracy: "It's not nice to put your forefathers in the living room and your foremothers in the basement."

With us today is someone who understood immediately the importance of honoring our suffrage leaders. Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska introduced the Joint Resolution to Move the Suffrage monument to the Rotunda. We thank Senator Stevens and ask that he make a few remarks about his involvement in the effort to move the statue.

BOSNIA

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I wanted to take a few moments to share with my Senate colleagues my concerns regarding our current policy in Bosnia.

The situation in Bosnia is a tragedy, there is no question. It is a tragedy borne by interventionist policies that have not worked, and will not work if allowed to continue. Most important, unless we reverse current policies, we are inviting for increased U.S. involvement, in the form of air support now and ground troops tomorrow. That must not happen.

The conflict between the Moslems and Serbs that reside in Bosnia did not begin with the fall of the former Yugoslavian Government. The conflict has roots of animosity that are far deeper—roots that stretch back for centuries. This is just the latest chapter, the latest reincarnation, of a brutal civil war between ethnic factions. What makes this latest chapter of conflict more tragic is the fact that one side has been prevented from defending its people by governments and organizations that claim to support their interests.

Mr. President, I believe we should not send U.S. ground troops to Bosnia for two basic reasons. First, there is no clear objective, no national security interest that justifies deploying American forces into a regional civil war.

American lives are sacred. As an army lieutenant who served in Vietnam, I strongly oppose sending our young men and women to Bosnia as a

separate force or under U.N. command. It is plain common sense that you do not commit American forces without a clear plan or purpose. To do otherwise would not be fair to our troops. It would not be fair to their families. At this time, no clear plan or purpose exists that would justify U.S. troop deployment.

Second, I oppose sending American troops to Bosnia because I believe it would only make matters worse in the region. I am concerned that the insertion of American forces to carry out current policies in Bosnia would only extend the conflict. Again, Mr. President, this is a civil war. Past history suggests that when foreign governments intervene in a civil war, they serve to exacerbate the conflict.

We must not forget our own history. We had a civil war of our own—the bloodiest, costliest conflict in our Nation's history. It was a long, brutal affair. Yet, had England or France entered on the side of the Confederacy at that time—which they considered doing—I believe our civil war would have gone on far longer—meaning more pain, more suffering, more lives lost on both sides.

The same is true in Bosnia. We have seen outside parties, mainly the United Nations, intervene in Bosnia already. This intervention included an arms embargo that has prevented a legitimate government from defending itself. It has prevented the citizens of a legitimate government from defending their homes and property. This intervention has done nothing more than allow the conflict to drag on with no end in sight. This policy of intervention has failed. And unless we recognize this now, we will only make matters worse for the people in the region and for our own people at home.

So, again, Mr. President, let me state that our current interventionist policy in Bosnia has failed. It is wrong. And if allowed to continue, I fear it will mean U.S. troops in Bosnia. That must not happen. I oppose placing U.S. troops under our own leadership or under the authority of the United Nations in Bosnia in the midst of a Bosnian civil war. There is no commonsense justification for doing so. The Government of Bosnia has not asked for U.S. troops. The people of Bosnia know that U.S. troops will only make the conflict last longer and would claim more lives unnecessarily. They simply want the right to defend themselves. I agree. Let us give them that right, and let us keep our American forces here at home.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? JUST LOOK AT THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it does not take a rocket scientist to be aware that the U.S. Constitution forbids any President to spend even a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Con-

gress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when a politician or an editor or a commentator pops off that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that the Founding Fathers, two centuries before the Reagan and Bush Presidencies, made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress—a duty Congress cannot escape—to control Federal spending.

Thus, it is the fiscal irresponsibility of Congress that has created the incredible Federal debt which stood at \$4,936,735,579,244.31 as of the close of business Friday, July 21. This outrageous debt—which will be passed on to our children and grandchildren—averages out to \$18,739.93 for every man, woman, and child in America.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House, received on July 21, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ARMEY) signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1944. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:56 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill; in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate: